

Remarks

Reconsideration and further examination is respectfully requested in light of the foregoing amendment, and in consideration of these remarks.

Claims 4 and 6-10 are pending in this application. Claims 1-3 and 5 previously have been cancelled.

The Examining Attorney rejected Claims 4, 6, and 8-10 on the basis of O'Hara et al (U.S. Patent 5,069,141) under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). Claim 7 was rejected on the basis of Section 103 over O'Hara.

All rejections are traversed in this paper. Accordingly, Claims 4, and 6 through 10 are pending in this application.

Location of Support for Amendments:

Applicant appeals to the paragraphs [0035] and [0037-0038] for support for the amendments made in this paper. Other locations in the Specification may be more or less relevant. Applicant requests the Examiner to consider these locations, and any others that may be relevant.

Response to Rejections: Section 102(b) Issues:

Basis: The Examiner rejected all Claims 4, 6, and 7-10 on the basis of O'Hara, citing to the presence of a load bearing section as labeled 43. The Examiner considers item 43 to be the "load bearing section." With reference to paragraphs [0035] and [0037-0038], Applicant has now amended the language of each of the independent claims to now refer to a "load bearing platform" rather than a "load bearing section." Applicant believes that even if item 43 in O'Hara could be characterized as part of the load bearing "section", it

would not be characterized as a “platform.” Accordingly, a limitation or element of each of the independent claims is not present in O’Hara, and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection for these independent claims and all claims dependent therefrom.

Response to Rejection: Section 103 Issues re Claim 7:

With respect to Claim 7, the claim depends from Claim 6, which pursuant to the discussion above is believed to be allowable. As dependent from an allowable claim, Claim 7 is also believed to be allowable.

The arguments set forth herein are not exclusive or exhaustive, and Applicant reserves the right to assert other distinctions, but does not deem such argument necessary in light of the force of the distinctions discussed above.

Applicant respectfully seeks withdrawal of the rejection.

Fees

No extension of time is believed to be necessary in connection with this paper, but if any extension is required in order for this paper to be considered, such an extension is hereby requested. This response therefore is timely. An authorization to charge deposit account 50-0954 is also enclosed to cover any deficiency. To the extent any petition is required in order for this response to be considered timely, or otherwise to maintain the pendency of this Application, this paper is deemed to include and to be such a petition.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that in light of the foregoing, all rejections to the application should be withdrawn. Applicant has diligently sought to comply with all

requirements and to respond to any arguments. The Application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and early approval is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Nathan W. Johnson, Esq.
Attorney of Record
Reg. No. 44,173
205-521-8369 (Voice)
205-488-6369 (Fax)
njohnson@bradleyarant.com

Date: August 20, 2007

AUTHORIZATION TO CHARGE DEPOSIT ACCOUNT 50-0954

If, after processing the enclosed correspondence, any charges, fees, or sums due remain unpaid in connection with this correspondence, I hereby authorize the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks to charge all such remaining fees, charges, and other sums due to Deposit Account Number **50-0954**.

Date: August 20, 2007

Nathan W. Johnson
Authorized User

Certificate of Transmission

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office via the Office electronic filing system (i.e., via EFSweb) in accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.6(a)(4), on **August 20, 2007**

Date: August 20, 2007

Signed:

Nathan W. Johnson
Reg. No. 44,173